DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 939 CG 023 840

AUTHOR Kimmel, Ellen B.; Nevill, Dorothy D.
TITLE Comparison of Values and Roles for Adult Women and Men from Five International Cultures.
PUB DATE Jul 90
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the International Congress of Cross Cultural Psychology (10th, Nara, Japan, July,1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adults; Comparative Analysis; *Cross Cultural Studies; *Cultural Differences; Foreign Countries; *Role Perception; *Sex Differences; Sex Role; *Values
IDENTIFIERS Canada; Portugual; United States; Yugoslavia

ABSTRACT

This study examined sex differences in values and roles reported by five samples of adults from North America and Europe. The data were derived from a larger set gathered as part of the Work Importance Study (WIS) in which researchers in a dozen countries developed the two instruments in their own language. The question posed here related to the number, direction, and pattern of sex differences among the adults for whom these data were available by sex. Subjects included 5,160 English-speaking Canadians, 1,222 French-speaking Canadians, 1,836 United States citizens, 344 Yugoslavs, and 136 Portuguese adults for whom data on sex differences were available on both scales. Instruments used were the Salience Inventory and the Values Scale. In viewing the pattern of sex differences across cultures, it was apparent that there is a range. English-speaking Canadians showed the greatest number of sex differences, while Francofone Canadians showed the fewest. Since Portuguese and Yugoslavian participants showed similar patterns to those from the United States, both in terms of number and direction, it cannot be argued that women's greater participation in political and economic change in the United States resulting in presumably expanded roles has produced substantially different values relations between sexes. As a group, the women from the five samples indicated higher values and participation than the men. The patterns of difference reflected some traditional and some nontraditional relations. (LLL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED339939

CG023840

Comparison of Values and Roles for Adult Women and Men from Five International Cultures

Ellen B. Kimmel and Dorothy D. Nevill

University of South Florida University of Florida

The present study describes sex differences in values and roles reported by five samples of adults from North America and Europe. The data were derived from a larger set gathered as part of the Work Importance Study (WIS) in which researchers in a dozen countries developed the two instruments in their own language. The question posed here related to the number, direction and pattern of sex differences among the adults for whom these data were available by sex. Admittedly, this look at sex differences is considered preliminary since their fuller interpretation will require placing them into a cultural, occupational, and social class context. Nonetheless, such a comparison is viewed as worthwhile is as much as similarities and differences across cultures yield some interesting hypotheses for further investigation.

Super (1980) proposed an expanded definition of careers as "the combination and sequence of roles played by a person during the course of a lifetime" (p. 282). Major roles he considered are student, citizen, worker, homemaker (spouse and parent) and leisurite and were seen as occurring either sequentially or

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ellen B. Kimmel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

simultaneously. Depending on situational and personal events, these roles increase and decrease in importance. Based in large part on Super's work, the informal consortium of autonomous researchers in 12 countries set about to examine the validity of his model for adolescents and adults from a variety of occupations. They began their work by reviewing the literature on work importance to search for the predominant situational determinants that were influencing role change. For several cultures, the increased involvement of women in the workforce was found to be significant, although this was uneven (far more potent in North America than for Australia or Portugal, for example) (Super, Kidd, & Knasel, 1980; Rowland, 1980; Marques, 1983, April). In the U.S., Farmer (1983) found that girls scored higher than boys on both commitment to home and work, and Super & Nevill (1984) that boys had greater commitment to work than home while the reverse was true for girls. While these data reflect changing expectations of youth, the present data from adults reflect changes that are being lived, that is a social structure in transition.

Method

Participants

There were 5160 English speaking Canadians, 1222 French speaking Canadians, 1836 U.S. Citizens, 344 Yugoslavs and 136

Portuguese adults for whom sex differences were available on both scales. These persons represented a range of occupations, although the number of persons from the lowest socioeconomic levels were underrepresented and those from the upper levels correspondingly overrepresented.

Instruments

The Salience Inventory (SI) (Super & Nevill, 1985) consists of three parts: (1) Participation in the roles of Student, Worker, Citizen, Homemaker and Leisurite; (2) Commitment to each of these roles; and (3) Value Expectations in each role. The Participation part consists of the behavioral component of role importance and the other two parts of two different affective components. The SI was developed by small international teams who studied their national literature, drafted specifications and sample items that were discussed in plenary sessions, reviewed and revised. Content validity was assured by the development method and construct validity though comparison of the SI and other work measures with expected results (Shears, 1982, July). Concurrent validity was demonstrated by interscale correlations (Marques, Miranda, Pinto, & Duarte, 1983; Nevill & Super, 1985). Reliability was ascertained though field trials of the national instruments that showed alpha coefficients of .80 and above (Marques, 1982, July).

The Values Scale (Super & Nevill, 1985) was developed in the same manner and at the same time as the SI and consists of 106 items that measure 18 -20 life values, ranging from social, intellectual, to physical activity and personal development. The respondent is asked to indicate for each value statement the importance from 1 (no importance) to 4 (very important). For the cross national comparisons only 60 items (3 per value) are used that are common to all the Value Scales.

Procedure

The methods for data collection varied from mailed survey to onsite requests for instrument completion for various student and occupational groups. For example, the U.S. data are comprised of several data gathering endeavors, and all groups were combined for purposes of both cross cultural and cross cultural by sex comparisons.

Results

Table 1 depicts the Values Scale means for adults from the five cultures included here. The bold numbers indicate the highest mean among the five cultures. As can be seen, the highest values for all five groups were for Ability Utilization (e.g., as reflected by an item, "Use all my skills and knowledge"), Achievement ("Have results which show that I have done well"), and Personal Development (Develop as a person"). The lowest values

for these samples were for Risk and Participation (the latter as reflected in "Work hard physically" or "Use powerful machines"), with the widest range of means also being on Participation ($\bar{x}$=4.58).

Table 2 shows the same comparison for the SI Scales. While Studying consistently yielded high scores on the behavioral part, Working and Home and Family scores were higher on the two values parts, most likely due to the fact that a number of the sub-samples were professionals in training (graduate students). At the point that they responded they were students or student-practitioners and not primarily workers, despite their higher values for working.

Tables 3 - 9 display the significant sex difference (means and p's) for each cultural group, separately, for the Values and the SI Inventories. A t-test was used in all cases.

Table 10 lists the p values for the significant sex differences for the five groups on the Value Scale in descending order of number of differences. That is, the values for which all five groups were found to have a significant sex difference are listed first, those with four groups next, three groups next, etc. The positive sign indicates that women had a higher mean than men and the negative sign the reverse. Several sex role stereotypical differences were found, along with some reversals. For example,

given women's greater socialization to value "connection", it is not surprising that they would evidence greater value for Social Interaction and Social Relations. In the U.S. sample, the reverse was found for Social Interaction, however, with men reporting a higher value than women. The fact that men held greater value for Authority and Risk in four of five cultures and Physical Prowess and Physical Activity in three and two cultures, respectively, fits the stereotype of the male role as "agenic". In general, women reported significantly higher values. Of the 60 significant sex differences (out of 98 possible), 41 of these were due to women's higher scores. This may reflect the fact that women have added value to work roles while maintaining their traditionally high value for the roles of family and home. There was at least one apparent reversal of expected sex differences. Women from three groups valued Autonomy more highly than men, a value normally assumed to be more important for men from western societies.

In viewing the pattern of sex differences across cultures, it is apparent there is a range. English speaking Canadians showed the greatest number of sex differences (16 out of 20 possible) while Francofone Canadians the fewest (10 of 20). Since Portuguese and Yugoslavian participants showed similar patterns to those from the U.S., both in terms of number and direction, it

cannot be argued that women's greater participation in political and economic change in the U.S. resulting in presumably expanded roles has produced substantially different values relations between the sexes.

Table 11 shows the p values of sex differences across the five groups on the SI, again, in descending order of frequency. Of the 15 areas, Participation in Home and Family was the only one where all five yielded a sex difference, this time in the expected (i.e., traditional) direction. That is, women indicated investing more time in home and family activities than men: however, Commitment and Role Values were significantly higher for women in only three and one country, respectively. The overall number of sex differences for the SI was relatively smaller (of 75 possible comparisons, only 26 or 33% revealed a difference between women and men) than for values on the Values Scale (66% or 60 of 98). While women showed a traditional pattern on Home and Family Participation, they also evidenced a higher commitment for Working among Yugoslavians and French Canadians, but no higher Role Value except in Yugoslavia. Yet, in the U.S. sample, women reported a significantly lower value for working than men as compared to French Canadian women who were higher than their male counterparts. Again, the small number of differences is more notable. Women and men appear to feel they participate and value

most roles to a similar degree regardless of culture, although women report generally higher values (18 of 26 differences favored women). Indeed, these data may be more reflective of the expansion in women's roles into the workplace than a shift away from home and family.

Discussion

To more fully explicate the findings reported above, they must be placed into a fuller context to include occupation, social class, and cultural and political affiliation. To do this would require sorting the differences by each of these variables and extensive discussion among experts on gender roles from each culture. As a group, the women from the five samples indicated higher values and participation (41/60 and 18/26, respectively, differences favored women) than the men. The patterns of difference reflected some traditional and some nontraditional relations, indicating that "things are changin' all over," at least in these North American and European Countries.

References

Farmer, H. S. (1983). Career and homemaking plans for high school youth. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30, 40-45.

Marques, J. F. (1983, April). Values and role salience in high school students in Portugal and the USA. In D. E. Super (Chair), Values and roles in diverse modern societies.

Symposium conducted at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

Rowland, R. (1980). Attitudes to sex roles: A discussion of Australian data and of methodology. The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 16, 85-90.

Super, D. E. (1980). A life-span, life-space approach to career development. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 16, 282-298.

Super, D. E., Kidd, J. M., & Knasel, E. G. (1980). Work values and work salience: A survey of literature in fourteen countries. Unpublished manuscript, National Institute for Careers Education and Counselling, Hertford, England.

Super, D. E., & Nevill, D. D. (1984). Work role salience as a determinant of career maturity in high school students. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 25, 30-44.

Super, D. E., & Nevill, D. D. (1985). The Values Scale. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Super, D. E., & Nevill, D. D. (1985). The Salience Inventory. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Table 1

Comparison of Value Means for Adults from Five International Cultures

	Canadians (English)	U.S. Citizens	Canadians (French)	Yugoslavs	Portuguese	
n	5160	1836	1222	344	136	
Value Scale						
Ability Utilization	10.24	10.35	10.61	10.10	**11.18**	Hi
Achievement	10.02	9.94	9.77	10.09	**10.28**	Hi
Advancement	8.27	8.85	9.34	8.40	**9.49**	
Aesthetics	8.18	8.38	**9.57**	9.25	8.99	
Altruism	9.35	9.13	**9.55**	9.43	9.39	
Authority	**8.56**	7.54	7.89	6.27	6.15	
Autonomy	**9.75**	9.64	9.66	8.91	8.88	
Creativity	8.81	8.67	9.31	8.54	**9.85**	
Economics	9.48	9.09	**9.67**	9.59	8.07	
Life Style	8.93	9.14	**9.35**	8.40	8.63	
Personal Development	10.55	10.34	**10.88**	10.30	10.76	Hi
Physical Activity	7.70	7.15	**8.24**	7.89	7.54	
Prestige	**9.05**	8.60	8.60	7.73	6.17	
Risk	5.50	5.96	6.28	**6.85**	6.09	Lo
Social Interaction	7.24	7.69	7.95	7.86	**8.97**	
Social Relations	9.77	9.01	**10.17**	9.93	9.31	
Variety	7.59	7.28	**8.24**	7.62	7.67	
Working Conditions	8.71	8.49	9.24	**9.64**	8.18	
Cultural Identity	**7.57**	7.25	7.30	7.10	----	
Participation	5.22	5.62	4.59	**9.17**	----	

Note: The bold faced number indicates the highest mean.

Table 2

Comparison of Salience Inventory Means for Adults from Five International Cultures

	Canadian (English)	U.S.	Canadian (French)	Yugoslav	Port-uguese
n	5160	979	1222	344	136
PARTICIPATION					
Studying	23.95	24.48	23.60	20.93	**26.31**
Working	29.46	30.39	29.11	**30.44**	29.67
Community Service	18.76	18.24	17.16	**19.75**	17.38
Home & Family	**28.51**	27.04	24.42	25.80	17.53
Leisure Activities	**26.84**	25.24	26.25	25.93	23.72
COMMITMENT					
Studying	25.93	27.75	26.00	24.80	**29.98**
Working	34.13	34.18	33.03	33.53	**35.82**
Community Services	23.01	23.64	20.43	22.46	**25.45**
Home & Family	**35.47**	35.04	28.11	31.47	20.87
Leisure Activities	28.84	28.23	28.22	**29.58**	25.63
ROLE VALUES					
Studying	34.68	35.57	35.95	33.16	**46.29**
Working	44.18	43.71	45.29	41.92	**52.69**
Community Services	31.44	31.26	30.04	29.31	**38.41**
Home & Family	**45.95**	43.56	40.98	40.62	36.95
Leisure Activities	40.05	37.63	40.22	38.93	**44.01**

Note: The bold faced number indicates the highest mean.

Table 3
Significant Mean Sex Differences on the Value Scale and the Salience Inventory for Canadian Anglophones

	Males	Females	p
n	1803	335	
Value Scale			
Ability Utilization	10.07	**10.35**	<.05
Achievement	9.92	**10.09**	<.05
Aesthetics	**8.63**	8.09	<.05
Altruism	8.71	**9.65**	<.05
Autonomy	9.65	**9.85**	<.05
Life Style	8.76	**9.06**	<.05
Personal Develop	10.19	**10.76**	<.05
Prestige	8.92	**9.16**	<.05
Risk	**5.95**	5.23	<.05
Social Interaction	6.89	**7.41**	<.05
Social Relations	9.22	**10.10**	<.05
Variety	7.23	**7.79**	<.05
Work Conditions	8.24	**8.93**	<.05
Cultural Identity	7.32	**7.74**	<.05
Physical Prowess	**5.51**	5.04	<.05
Salience Inventory			
PARTICIPATION			
Home & Family	26.88	**29.38**	<.01

Table 4

Significant Mean Sex differences on the Value Scale for U.S. Citizens

	Males	Females	p
n	1064	772	
Value Scale			
Achievement	9.67	**10.32**	<.01
Advancement	8.79	**9.00**	<.05
Aesthetics	8.19	**8.65**	<.01
Authority	**7.91**	7.07	<.01
Economics	8.91	**9.38**	<.01
Personal Develop	10.09	**10.70**	<.01
Risk	**6.28**	5.54	<.01
Social Interaction	**7.82**	7.52	<.01
Social Relations	8.71	**9.43**	<.01
Variety	7.06	**7.62**	<.01
Working Conditions	8.16	**8.99**	<.01
Cultural Identity	7.05	**7.51**	<.01
Physical Prowess	**5.92**	5.23	<.01

Table 5

Significant Mean Sex Differences on the Salience Inventory for U.S. Citizens

	Males	Females	p
n	489	490	
Salience Inventory			
PARTICIPATION			
Study	**24.58**	23.88	<.01
Home	26.25	**28.14**	<.01
COMMITMENT			
Study	**28.28**	27.06	<.01
Community	23.05	**24.42**	<.01
Home	34.61	**35.63**	<.01
ROLE VALUES			
Study	**36.28**	34.64	<.01
Work	**44.27**	42.91	<.01
Community	30.65	**32.27**	<.05

Table 6

Significant Mean Sex Differences on the Value Scale for Canadian Francophones

	Males	Females	p
n	479	743	
Value Scale			
Ability Utilization	10.39	**10.76**	<.05
Aesthetics	9.34	**9.65**	<.05
Altruism	9.39	**9.73**	<.05
Authority	**8.11**	7.72	<.05
Personal develop	10.64	**11.03**	<.05
Social Interaction	7.74	**8.15**	<.05
Social Relations	9.67	**10.47**	<.05
Variety	8.07	**8.65**	<.05
Work Conditions	8.65	**9.59**	<.05
Physical Prowess	**4.80**	4.42	<.05

Table 7

Significant Mean Sex Differences on the Salience Inventory for Canadian Francophones

	Males	Females	p
n	479	743	
PARTICIPATION			
Studying	23.21	**23.86**	<.01
Home & Family	23.62	**24.94**	<.01
COMMITMENT			
Studying	24.89	**26.72**	<.01
Working	32.38	**33.44**	<.01
Home & Family	27.76	**28.34**	<.01
Leisure Activities	28.03	**28.34**	<.05
ROLE VALUES			
Studying	35.07	**36.51**	<.05
Working	44.80	**45.61**	<.01
Home & Family	39.94	**41.64**	<.01

Table 8

Significant Mean Sex Differences on the Value Scale and the Salience Inventory for Yugoslavians

	Males	Females	p
n	193	151	
Value Scale			
Altruism	9.26	**9.65**	<.05
Authority	**6.48**	6.01	<.05
Autonomy	**9.21**	8.52	<.01
Creativity	**8.90**	8.09	<.01
Economics	9.40	**9.82**	<.05
Physical Activity	**8.34**	7.30	<.01
Risk	**7.13**	6.48	<.01
Social Interaction	7.59	**8.19**	<.01
Social Relations	9.58	**10.37**	<.01
Working Conditions	9.28	**10.11**	<.01
Salience Inventory			
PARTICIPATION			
Study	**21.92**	19.67	<.01
Home	23.91	**28.21**	<.01
Community	**20.84**	18.35	<.01
COMMITMENT			
Work	32.92	**34.32**	<.05
Home	29.90	**33.47**	<.01
ROLE VALUES			
Study	**34.46**	31.50	<.01
Home	39.78	**41.70**	<.05
Community	**30.44**	27.87	<.05

Table 9

Significant Mean Sex Differences on the Value Scale and the Salience Inventory for the Portugese

	Males	Females	p
n	86	50	
Value Scale			
Authority	**6.62**	5.80	<.05
Autonomy	8.74	**8.92**	<.05
Creativity	9.79	**9.90**	<.05
Economics	**8.26**	7.88	<.05
Life Style	8.55	**8.78**	<.05
Personal Develop	10.71	**10.80**	<.05
Physical Activity	**8.03**	6.84	<.01
Prestige	**6.37**	5.92	<.01
Risk	**6.26**	5.78	<.01
Social Interaction	8.64	**9.30**	<.01
Social Relations	9.27	**9.52**	<.01
Variety	7.55	**7.84**	<.01
Working Conditions	7.92	**8.64**	<.01
Salience Inventory			
PARTICIPATION Home	16.17	**18.66**	<.05

Table 10

Comparison of Mean Sex Differences Among the Five International Cultures on the Value Scale

	Canadians (English)	Port-uguese	U.S. citizens	Canadians (French)	Yugoslavs
n	5160	136	1836	1222	344
n difference	16/20	13/18	13/20	10/20	11/20
Social Interaction	.05+	.01+	.01-	.05+	.01+
Social Relations	.05+	.01+	.01+	.05+	.01+
Working Conditions	.05+	.01+	.01+	.05+	.01+
Authority	----	.05-	.01-	.05-	.05-
Personal Development	.05+	.05+	.01+	.05+	----
Risk	.05-	.01-	.01-	----	.01-
Variety	.05+	.01+	.01+	.05+	----
Aesthetics	.05-	----	.01+	.05+	----
Altruism	.05+	----	----	.05+	.05+
Autonomy	.05+	.05+	----	----	.05+
Economics	.05+	.05-	----	----	.01-
Physical Prowess	.05-	----	.01-	.05-	----
Ability Utilization	.05+	----	.01+	----	----
Achievement	.05+	----	.01+	----	----
Creativity	----	.05+	----	----	.01-
Life Style	.01+	.05+	----	----	----
Physical Activity	----	.01-	----	----	.01-
Prestige	.05+	.01-	----	----	----
Cultural Identity	.05+	na	.01+	----	----

Note. The "+" indicates a larger mean for females & the "-" indicates a larger mean for males.

Table 11

Comparison of Significant Mean Sex Differences on the Salience Inventory for the Five International Cultures.

	Yugoslavs	Canadians (French)	U.S. Citizens	Canadians (English)	Portuguese
n	344	1222	979	5160	136
PARTICIPATION Home & Family	.01+	.01+	.01+	.01+	.05+
PARTICIPATION Studying	.01-	.01+	.01-	----	----
COMMITMENT Home & Family	.01+	.01+	.01+	----	----
ROLE VALUES Studying	.01-	.05+	.01-	----	----
COMMITMENT Studying	----	.01+	.01-	----	----
COMMITMENT Working	.05+	.01+	----	----	----
ROLE VALUES Working	----	.01+	.01-	----	----
ROLE VALUES Comm Service	.05-	----	.05+	----	----
PARTICIPATION Comm Service	.01-	----	----	----	----
COMMITMENT Comm Service	----	----	.01+	----	----
COMMITMENT Leisure Activity	---	.05+	----	----	----
ROLE VALUES Home & Family	.05+	----	----	----	----

Note: The "+" indicates a larger mean for females and the "-" indicates a larger mean for the males.

Table 12

Comparison of Mean Sex Differences on the Value Scale for the Five International Cultures.

	Canadian (English)	U.S. Citizens	Canadian (French)	Yugoslav	Portugese
			Values		
Ability Utilization	+ 0.28	+ 0.13	+ 0.37	- 0.17	+ 0.06
Achievement	+ 0.17	+ 0.65	+ 0.24	- 0.16	+ 0.02
Advancement	+ 0.54	+ 0.21	+ 0.15	- 0.29	- 0.21
Aesthetics	+ 0.17	+ 0.56	+ 0.31	+ 0.28	- 0.21
Altruism	+ 0.94	+ 0.13	+ 0.34	+ 0.39	- 0.13
Authority	- 0.05	- 0.84	- 0.39	- 0.37	- 0.82
Autonomy	+ 0.20	- 0.09	+ 0.27	- 0.69	+ 0.18
Creativity	- 0.06	_ 0.03	+ 0.01	- 0.81	+ 0.11
Economics	- 0.11	+ 0.47	+ 0.03	+ 0.42	- 0.36
Life Style	+ 0.20	+ 0.01	+ 0.27	- 0.09	+ 0.23
Personal Development	+ 0.65	+ 0.61	+ 0.39	+ 0.16	+ 0.09
Physical Activity	- 0.16	+ 0.03	+ 0.06	- 0.04	- 1.19
Prestige	+ 0.24	+ 0.17	+ 0.29	+ 0.34	- 0.45
Risk	- 0.72	- 0.74	- 0.29	- 0.65	- 0.48
Social Interaction	+ 0.52	- 0.30	+ 0.41	+ 0.60	+ 0.66
Social Relations	+ 0.88	+ 0.72	+ 0.80	+ 0.79	+ 0.45
Variety	+ 0.56	+ 0.56	+ 0.58	+ 0.46	+ 0.29
Work Conditions	+ 0.69	+ 0.83	+ 0.54	+ 0.83	+ 1.35
Cultural Identity	+ 0.42	+ 0.46	+ 0.36	+ 0.13	------
Physical Prowess	- 0.47	- 0.69	- 0.38	+ 0.06	------